

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

January 30, 2001 LB 225

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Chambers. For discussion on the Chambers amendment to LB 225, Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature. My reaction to the Chambers amendment is sort of like slightly negative indifference (laugh), meaning I don't think it makes a difference one way or the other. The reason I have a...sort of a negative reaction to it is because I think he wants to make the argument that his choice of language is better and it evinces that this is badly drafted, wrong-headed, not serious, and if that's your...if that's what you think then I'd vote against the amendment because that's not true. The use of the language here is just fine. It's acceptable. But if Senator Chambers wants to improve it and if you see a sense of improvement, that's okay. The problem would be like this. Look, I've got some vitamins. I want you to give it to your three-year-old kids because it will help them be tall. And you say, well, what's tall? And I say, six feet. And Ernie would say, no, no, oh, that's wrong; you've made a big mistake there; you should say I'm going to give you these because I want your kids to be tall and then when you ask the question, what's tall, should say the potential to be six feet tall. Well, no, I think the actual claim is, look, I'm going to give you these vitamins, hopefully so your kids can be tall. And then, when you ask me for a definition of what that is, I tell you what I think it is. And that's what's going on here. Section 8 says, look, we want venture capital to help us for companies that have a high risk of loss and a potential for profit that are, in fact, high-growth companies. And then we say, and when we use the word "high growth", look, an example of high growth or a definition of high growth is one that would grow by 20 percent. Are we promising that this is only for companies that grow for 20 percent or more? No. Is it a limitation? No. But when we use the phrase "potential for high growth" and you were to ask me what does "high growth" mean, I say, in Section 6 "high growth" is a company that grows 20 percent a year. That's high growth. And, in fact, Senator Chambers just told us it's faster growth than the stock market is doing and wouldn't that be a relatively good working definition of what "high growth" is? So, is it badly drafted? No. Is it nonsensical? No. Does it